

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised in the Office action, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1-14 are pending and rejected. Applicants previously canceled claims 15-21. In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1-5 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 issued to Worthington (hereon after "*Worthington*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0154116 published to Lofton (hereon after "*Lofton*").

The Office also rejected claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 issued to Worthington (hereon after "*Worthington*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 issued to Lofton (hereon after "*Lofton*"), in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078752 published to Johnson Jr. (hereon after "*Johnson*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In the *Office Action*, the Office indicated that "a laptop is a hand-held, and all computers are calculators." *Office Action*, at page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees and wishes to clarify. A laptop is a hand-held computer and a computer is a computing device and "a programmable usually electronic device that can store, retrieve, and process data" (Merriam Webster). A person of ordinary skill in the art would distinguish between a computing device, a computer, and a calculator, and would utilize a computer and a calculator differently. Thus, Applicant submits that even though a computer is a computing device, it is not a calculator and it is not utilized as a calculator.

Claims 1 and 8 recite a combination of elements directed to a “hand-held calculator.” The combination of elements includes “create a time management entry in a time management application; attach a file stored in the memory to the time management entry; and display the file on a display of the hand-held computer device.”

Worthington discloses “the system 1 of the invention in implemented through a data processing unit such as a mainframe computer, a home computer, or a laptop. *Worthington*, at col. 3 lines 52-55. Therefore, unlike claim 1, *Worthington* discloses a laptop and not a hand-held device. *Lofton*, on the other hand, specifically discloses “personal computer”, for example, pages 1-3 and 9-10. *Lofton* is devoid from disclosing a “hand-held device”, as recited in claim 1. *Worthington* and *Lofton*, alone and in combination, are devoid from disclosing a “hand-held calculator”. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 8 are patent in view of *Worthington* and *Lofton*, alone and in combination.

Moreover, Applicants note that the Office cited *Worthington* and *Lofton* for the proposition that it teaches all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 8, from which the dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14 ultimately depend. The Applicants also note that the Office only cited *Johnson* with respect to the subject matter claimed in the dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14.

Given that each of the dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from either independent amended claim 1 or 8, each necessarily includes all the elements of their respective independent claim. Since *Worthington* and *Lofton*, alone and in combination, do not teach all the elements of the independent claims 1 and 8 and since the Office only cited *Johnson* with respect to the subject matter claimed in the dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14, the Applicants, therefore, submit that *Worthington*, *Lofton* and *Johnson*, alone and in combination, do not teach all the elements or render claims 1 and 8 obvious. Thus, the Applicants further submit that *Worthington*, *Lofton* and *Johnson*, alone and in combination, do not render each of the dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14, depending from either claim 1 or 8, obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-4363 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2009

By: /MIRNA ABYAD/
MIRNA ABYAD
Registration No. 58,615
Texas Instruments
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-4365